

**GUIDE FOR PARTICIPATION  
IN CALIFORNIA'S  
STATEWIDE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT  
2001 -2002**

**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
SPECIAL EDUCATION DIVISION**

**June 1, 2001**

## **PREFACE**

The 1997 amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA '97) require that all states produce guidelines for the alternate assessment of children with disabilities who cannot take part in general statewide and district-wide assessment programs even with accommodations. States were required to implement an alternate assessment system no later than July 1, 2000.

The development of the California Alternate Assessment should be viewed as an evolving process. In order to meet mandated deadlines, this document describes the implementation of Phase 1 (2000-2001) and Phase 2 (2001-2002). Phase 3 will require a more rigorous alignment of content with state standards, a scoring process that ensures consistency and reliability, and a means of linking the alternate assessment to the state accountability system. Phase 3 will be field tested in selected areas in the Spring 2002, then will be implemented statewide during the 2002-2003 school year.

### **Purpose and Audiences for this Document**

The purpose of this document is to describe how students, whose IEP teams determine an alternate assessment is appropriate, are to participate in California's statewide assessment program. The information is provided as guidance to school and district administrators, teachers, parents/community members, and other IEP team members.

### **Contact Information**

Comments or questions about California's alternate assessment system should be addressed to the Assessment, Evaluation & Support Unit, Special Education Division, California Department of Education, 515 L Street, Suite 270, Sacramento, CA 95814, telephone (916) 445-4628 or fax (916) 327-3730.

## **BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT**

### **Requirements of Federal and California Law**

Federal and State laws require that all students with disabilities be included in general statewide and district-wide assessment programs with appropriate accommodations, if necessary. Students with more significant disabilities who cannot participate in general large-scale assessment programs even with accommodations must receive an alternate assessment. Section 612(a)(17) of IDEA '97 states:

"As appropriate, the State or local educational agency - (i) develops guidelines for the participation of children with disabilities in alternate assessments for those children who cannot participate in State and district-wide assessment programs; and (ii) develops and, beginning not later than July 1, 2000, conducts those alternate assessments."

Additionally, states and districts must:

- Report the number of children participating in alternate assessments;
- Report the performance of children on alternate assessments after July 1, 2000, if doing so would be statistically sound and not disclose the results of individual children;
- Ensure that IEP teams determine how each student will participate in large-scale assessment, and if not participating, describe how the child will be assessed; and

- Reflect the performance of all students with disabilities in performance goals and indicators that are used to guide State Improvement Plans.

While all state and district-wide assessment programs are expected to be as inclusive as possible of students with disabilities, the alternate assessment requirement of IDEA '97 applies particularly to California's Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program, because STAR is the state's primary accountability mechanism.

In 1998, the California's State Board of Education selected the multiple-choice portion of the Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition, Form T (Stanford 9) to be administered each spring to all students in grades 2 through 11. Since then, the test has also been augmented to align with State Board of Education adopted Curriculum Standards.

There are some potentially confusing differences between federal and California laws regarding the assessment of students with disabilities. California law for the STAR program (which was written prior to the passage of IDEA '97) requires participation of all students in grades 2 – 11, and allows IEP teams to identify accommodations and/or modifications needed for a particular student. However, it further states that IEP teams may exempt students with disabilities from participation in the STAR assessment: "Individuals with exceptional needs who have an explicit provision in their individualized education program that exempts them from the testing requirement of subdivision (b) shall be so exempt." (Education Code 60640 (e)).

Note, however, that even though California law permits students with disabilities to be exempted from STAR assessment, **FEDERAL LAW SUPERCEDES STATE LAW**, and requires that **ALL STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES** participate in state and district general assessment programs without accommodations, with accommodations, or with an alternate assessment.

California law also allows parents to exclude their children from statewide STAR assessment. The parent must initiate the request and it must be submitted in writing to school officials. **DISTRICTS MAY NOT SOLICIT PARENT EXEMPTIONS.**

Students with disabilities who cannot participate in the regular assessment even with accommodations must therefore participate in the state's alternate assessment program. A description of the student's participation in state and district-wide assessment must be documented in his/her IEP.

## **Assessment of Students with Disabilities in the Context of Standards-Based Reform**

### ***Principles and Features of Standards-Based Reform***

Inclusion in assessment is part of a broader, national movement to include students with disabilities in standards-based reform. This reform movement is guided by the principles that all students can achieve high standards, and that school systems are to be held accountable for students' educational results. Standards-based reform has at least three key features:

- Development of statewide content and performance standards that specify what students should know and be able to do. Presently, California has adopted content standards in English-Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and History/Social Science.

- Development of statewide assessment and accountability policies and programs that align with the standards. Presently, California implements the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program in grades 2 – 11. The assessment is aligned with the content standards.
- Decision-making by local districts about the specific curricular and instructional approaches they will use to attain the standards.

### ***Developing Inclusive Standards***

States differ greatly in the extent to which their standards emphasize academic and general life skills. Broadly defined standards that encompass both academic and general life skills tend to be more inclusive of a wide range of student ability levels, whereas more narrowly defined standards that focus solely on academic skills tend to be less inclusive of this range of ability levels.

California's content standards are defined as "the specific academic knowledge, skills, and abilities that all public schools are expected to teach and all pupils are expected to learn in each of the core curriculum areas, at each grade level." Presently, California's State Board of Education has adopted content and performance standards in the areas of English-Language Arts, Mathematics, History-Social Science, and Science. These standards focus on rigorous academic knowledge and skills, and look to preparation for careers and college. Rigorous academic standards such as these are appropriate for most students, including most students with disabilities. However, for some students with more significant disabilities, whose IEPs reflect significant modifications to the general education curriculum and emphasize functional life and social skills, such standards may be less applicable and might need to be modified or extended.

Given the academic rigor embodied in California's current content standards, it may be advisable at some point for the State and/or districts to consider developing broader standards. These broader, more inclusive standards could embody both core academic and non-academic content that is relevant to all students, including those with more significant disabilities.

## **ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES**

### **Purposes and Types of Assessment**

Assessments are done for various reasons. An important distinction is between individual student assessments and those conducted for broad-based accountability. Individual assessments are conducted to make a clinical diagnosis, to determine eligibility for services or programs, and to monitor students' ongoing progress. Assessments for accountability on the other hand, i.e., district and state assessments, are conducted to gather and report information that is useful in promoting system accountability at the school, district, or state level. These different purposes strongly influence an assessment's design, administration, and reporting procedures.

Within special education, the purposes of assessment have historically been individual in nature, e.g., to determine special education eligibility, to help set individual student goals and objectives, to guide instruction and services, and to evaluate individual student progress. A team of qualified professionals customizes the assessment to fit the unique needs of each child. Results of these individualized student assessments typically cannot be (nor have they in the past been intended to be) combined to report on the performance of schools, districts, or the State.

In contrast, states and districts have long done assessments of students in general education for purposes of system accountability. These large-scale tests are typically conducted in a group setting under controlled, standardized conditions, so that individual students' results are comparable and can be combined. Students' combined assessment results are then used to report on the overall performance of schools, districts, or the State.

### **Assessment Accommodations and Alternate Assessment**

Some students with disabilities need accommodations to take part in large-scale assessments. The purpose of accommodations is to minimize the influence of disabilities that are not relevant to the purpose of testing. According to the 1999 Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing, "accommodation" is a general term that can refer to any departure from standard testing content, format or administration procedures.

California's STAR program allows accommodations that are justified and described in the IEP. The test publisher has categorized accommodations as either "standard" or "non-standard," and the type of accommodations used may affect how the results are included in the reporting of school, district, and state assessment results. For a list and explanation of these different kinds of accommodations, please refer to the STAR program's website <http://www.cde.ca.gov/statetests/star/star.html>.

A small number of students with disabilities, particularly those with more significant disabilities (estimated at 1-2% of the entire student population) cannot meaningfully participate in general large-scale assessments even with accommodations. Rather than being excluded from the state assessment program altogether, the performance of these students must now be tested via an alternate assessment. Including all students in the states assessment programs will create a more accurate picture of the education system's performance. It will also lead to greater accountability for the educational outcomes of all students.

Alternate assessment is best understood as a means of including *all* students in the State's assessment and accountability program. The National Center for Educational Outcomes (Thurlow, Elliott, and Ysseldyke, 1998) refers to alternate assessment as the "ultimate accommodation" because it allows for all students to be counted in the accountability system.

### **Balancing the Need for Comparability with the Need for Individualization**

An important condition of the alternate assessment is that it be able to serve the purpose of large-scale system accountability. To meet this condition, comparable student results must be obtained and aggregated to produce an overall estimate of system performance. A necessary condition of comparability is that the assessment measures a common content.

This condition of comparability is a particularly challenging one in the development of an alternate assessment, given special education's historical and ongoing emphasis on individualizing instruction to meet the unique needs of each student. Developing common content and performance standards for all students represents a substantial shift in thinking about the education of students with disabilities. The development of common content and performance standards that specify what all students should know

and be able to do is fundamental to the standards-based reform movement. These common standards are expected to drive both instruction and assessment.

As special education's inclusive education reform agenda and general education's standards-based reform agenda continue to converge, such a balance is indeed possible. In accordance with IDEA' 97, IEPs are to be written with an emphasis on providing the specialized supports and services necessary to maximize access to the general education curriculum within general education settings wherever possible. Functional life and social skill areas that are addressed by a student's IEP must increasingly be linked to state standards and/or state curriculum frameworks (as opposed to being targeted in an isolated fashion in segregated settings).

Academic and functional skills can be viewed as a continuum, rather than an either/or choice. All students need functional skills. Some learn functional skills in the home or from peers and some learn them incidentally. Some students need to have functional skills taught directly. Functional skills provide students with the means to access the general curriculum and may be assessed as indicators of progress toward the academic content standards.

## **CALIFORNIA'S ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT SYSTEM**

### **Determining Eligibility for Participation in Alternate Assessment**

The California alternate assessment has been designed as an assessment that will include students with the most significant disabilities. An estimated 10-20% of students with disabilities (1-2% of the general student population) will be unable to participate in the STAR Program even with accommodations, and must receive an alternate assessment. The students who would typically be expected to participate in an alternate assessment are those who would be expected to progress through the state curriculum standards using extended benchmarks and indicators. Often, these students require some degree of support for post-school living, due to their cognitive abilities and adaptive behavior.

\*The alternate assessment is appropriate for a student if the IEP team agrees that the following statements apply to the student being assessed:

- 1) the student requires direct and extensive instruction to acquire, maintain, and generalize skills necessary for application in school, work, home, and community environments;
- 2) the student demonstrates cognitive abilities and adaptive behavior that require substantial adjustments to the general curriculum. The student may participate in many of the same activities as his/her non-disabled peers; however, his/her learning objectives and expected outcomes focus on the functional applications of the general curriculum;
- 3) the student is unable to participate in general large-scale statewide assessments, even when accommodations are provided;

The decision to include a student in the alternate assessment should **NOT** be primarily the result of:

- an administrative (as opposed to an IEP team) decision
- the amount of time the student receives special education services
- excessive or extended absences

- social, cultural, or economic differences
- deaf/blindness, visual, auditory, and/or motor disabilities
- achievement that is significantly lower than his or her same age peers
- a specific categorical label.

\*Criterion for participation was adopted from a document developed by Long Beach Unified School District.

Decisions regarding accommodations and participation in alternate or general statewide assessment must be documented in the IEP. The table below illustrates the relationship between choice of assessment procedure and the student's curricular emphasis. The unshaded areas represent appropriate choices of assessment given a particular curricular focus:

Curricular Emphasis	Type of Assessment		
	General (SAT-9) Assessment		Alternate Assessment
	Accommodations		
	None or Standard	Non-Standard	
General academic curriculum with or without minor instructional accommodations.	(60 – 70% of students with disabilities)		
General academic curriculum with significant instructional accommodations.		(25 – 30% of students with disabilities)	
Participation in the general academic curriculum to the maximum extent possible, with an emphasis on functional life and social skill development.			(10-20% of students with disabilities)

### Description of California's IEP-Based Alternate Assessment

Phases 1 and 2 of the California Alternate Assessment are based on the student's progress toward attaining his/her IEP goals. The IEP team members should discuss and reach consensus on uniform application of mastery standards. Scoring should be conducted by a member of the IEP team who is a credentialed school employee, typically the student's teacher. Ideally, the alternate assessment should be part of the student's most recent annual review for the school year reported.

### ***Phase One Implementation (July 2000-June 2001)***

In Phase 1 (July 2000 –June 2001) of California's statewide implementation, the alternate assessment entailed assigning each IEP goal into one of the following seven functional life skill domains (definitions and examples of each of these are listed in Appendix C):

- Communication
- Self-Care, Independent Living
- Motor Skills, Mobility
- Functional Academics
- Vocational Skills
- Social/Emotional Behavior
- Recreation/Leisure
- Other

Each goal was then rated according to the following rubric:

<b>Level of Progress/ Mastery</b> (with respect to the specific goal)	<b>10 Beginning</b>	<b>20 Transitional</b>	<b>30 Intermediate</b>	<b>40 Competent</b>
	No progress.	Partial progress (met 1-49% of the criteria).	Substantial progress (met 50-99% of the criteria).	Goal met or exceeded.

### ***Phase Two Implementation (July 2001-June 2002)***

In addition to the Phase 1 elements, Phase 2 will also require identifying the connection between each IEP goal and the broad core curriculum areas. The alternate assessment data collection form (Appendix B) has been modified to include a column for identifying which of the following California content areas are reflected in each IEP goal:

- English-Language Arts
- History-Social Science
- Mathematics
- Science
- Health
- Physical Education
- Visual and Performance Arts
- Other



The relationship between these two elements (core curriculum areas and functional content domains) is shown in the alignment matrix developed by California's Special Education Administrators of County Offices (SEACO).

<b>Core Curriculum Areas:</b>	<b>Functional Life and Social Skill Domains:</b>						
	Communication	Self-Care/ Independent Living	Motor Skills/ Mobility	Functional Academics	Vocational	Social/ Emotional Behavior	Recreation/ Leisure
English/ Language Arts	▪			▪	▪		▪
Mathematics				▪	▪		▪
History/Social Science				▪	▪	▪	▪
Science				▪	▪		▪
Visual and Performing Arts	▪		▪		▪	▪	▪
Health	▪	▪			▪	▪	▪
Physical Education			▪		▪	▪	▪

Additionally, Phase 2 implementation will also include an emphasis on validating the information sources used in arriving at IEP goal mastery rating decisions. For each mastery rating provided, the data source(s) used in arriving at that rating must be identified:

- Performance assessment
- Work sample analysis
- Teacher observation
- Parent/guardian observation
- Standardized or commercial assessment
- Other (specify)\_\_\_\_\_

Appendix B displays the data collection form and instructions that are used to score mastery achieved on eligible students' IEP goals. The information recorded on the form will be aggregated and reported at the State, district and school levels, subject to the limitations imposed by confidentiality requirements. Information will be presented in summary fashion such that individual students are not identifiable in these reports.

This phased approach to implementing California's alternate assessment system is designed to allow sufficient time for professional development that will enable local teachers and administrators to develop more standards-driven, data-based IEPs.

### **Multiple Measures at the Local Level**

In addition to participating in the state's IEP-based alternate assessment, local education agencies may also wish to use other measures to create a more comprehensive picture of students' educational experiences and outcomes. Depending on the availability of resources and feasibility, one or more of the following options may be considered:

- 1) Evaluate performance and independence with respect to specific benchmarks and indicators developed within each content area.
- 2) Evaluate performance and independence using a commercially available assessment.
- 3) Document the presence of natural peer supports.
- 4) Document the availability and use of assistive technology.
- 5) Document progress using a portfolio assessment.
- 6) Survey parent satisfaction with student outcomes and the instructional program.

- 7) Survey teacher satisfaction with student outcomes and the instructional program.
- 8) Document the amount of instructional time spent in each of the functional areas.

## **REFERENCES**

American Educational Research Association. (1999). Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. Washington, D.C.: (author).

Thurlow, M., Elliott, J., and Ysseldyke, J. (1998). Testing Students with Disabilities: Practical Strategies for Complying with District and State Requirements. Corwin: Thousand Oaks, California.

Ysseldyke, J., & Olsen, K. (1997). Putting alternate assessments into practice: What to measure and possible sources of data. National Center for Educational Outcomes Synthesis Report 28. University of Minnesota College of Education and Human Development.

**Appendix A**  
**California Alternate Assessment Workgroup Participants**

Loeb Aronin	Member, Advisory Commission on Special Education
Carol Bartz	Director, North Inland Special Education Region, San Diego SELPA
Larry Belkin	Chief, Special Education Services, Orange County Office of Education
Barbara Colton	Consultant, California Department of Education, Standards Curriculum and Assessment Division, Measurement & Reporting Office
Betty Connolly	El Dorado County SELPA
Elizabeth Cooley	Senior Research Associate and Director of Special Education Projects, WestEd
Larry Crabbe	Director, Research and Evaluation, Elk Grove Unified School District
Judy Elliott	Associate Superintendent, Long Beach Unified School District
Mary Falvey	Professor, California State University, Los Angeles, Division of Special Education
Mark Fetler	Consultant, Assessment, Evaluation & Support, Special Education Division, California Department of Education
Pam Hunt	Professor, San Francisco State University, Department of Special Education
Kristin Powers	Researcher, Long Beach Unified School District
Ron Kadish	Director, State Special Schools, Special Education Division, California Department of Education
Terry McLaughlin	Assistant Superintendent, Student Services, San Bernardino County Office of Education
Angela McNeece	Director, Special Education, Imperial County Office of Education Center for Exceptional Children
J. Vincent Madden	Administrator, Assessment, Evaluation & Support, Special Education Division, California Department of Education
Marion Miller	Consultant, California Department of Education, Standards Curriculum and Assessment Division, Standards and Curriculum Office
Lalit Roy	Consultant, California Department of Education, Assessment, Evaluation and Support, Special Education Division
Nancy Grosz Sager	Consultant, California Department of Education, State Special Schools and Services Division
Gerry Shelton	Manager, Measurement & Reporting Office, Standards Curriculum and Assessment Division, California Department of Education
Brenda Smith	Team of Advocates For Special Kids
Jacque Thousand	Professor, California State University, San Marcos, College of Education

## **Appendix B**

### **Alternate Assessment Data Collection Form (Phase 2, 2001 –2002 School Year)**

**Purpose.** The California Department of Education uses information collected through the Alternate Assessment Survey to produce federal reports required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Amendments of 1997, Public Law 105-17, Section 612(a)17. Results for individuals are confidential and subject to state and federal privacy requirements. Summary data are made available to educational institutions and the general public.

**Procedure.** Responsibility for filling out the Alternate Assessment Survey for a student should be delegated to a credentialed school employee who is a member of the student's IEP team, for example, a teacher. The student's most recent annual evaluation is the basis of the alternate assessment data collection. The IEP team should review and approve the ratings. Copies of the survey should be given to the student's parent or guardian and should be placed into the student's school folder.

For more information, see the Alternate Assessment Guidelines at:  
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/spbranch/sed/altassmt.pdf>

## Alternate Assessment Data Collection Form

### IDENTIFICATION

All information in this box is required. Please verify that all fields are filled in and correct. Enter the official county-district-school (CDS) code and SELPA code issued to the site where the student is receiving services. Contact your special education or site administrator, if necessary. These codes are required for processing the alternate assessment.

PRINT name of person completing form: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ Phone Number (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_

CDS Code \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_

SELPA Code \_\_\_\_\_

Student ID (CASEMIS Code) \_\_\_\_\_

Date when the IEP team reviewed and approved the completed Alternate Assessment Survey

Month \_\_\_\_\_ Day \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_

Primary Disability Category Code \_\_\_\_\_

First Name or Initial \_\_\_\_\_ Last Name or Initial \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Birth Month \_\_\_\_\_ Day \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_

Gender (circle one) M F

This form accommodates up to 12 goals. If you need more space, submit another form and check here [ ]. Provide the following information for each goal: Key words; functional focus; curricular content area; mastery/progress rating; reason goal not met (if mastery is less than 49 %); and the data source(s) used in rating mastery for each IEP goal.

Goal Key Words	Functional Focus (circle one)	Curricular Content Area (circle one)	Mastery/Progress (circle one)	Reason Goal Not Met (circle one)	Primary Data Source (circle one)	Secondary Data Source (circle one)
1.	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40	20 30 40 50 60 90	10 20 30 40 50 90	10 20 30 40 50 90
2.	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40	20 30 40 50 60 90	10 20 30 40 50 90	10 20 30 40 50 90
3.	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40	20 30 40 50 60 90	10 20 30 40 50 90	10 20 30 40 50 90
4.	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40	20 30 40 50 60 90	10 20 30 40 50 90	10 20 30 40 50 90
5.	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40	20 30 40 50 60 90	10 20 30 40 50 90	10 20 30 40 50 90
6.	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40	20 30 40 50 60 90	10 20 30 40 50 90	10 20 30 40 50 90
7.	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40	20 30 40 50 60 90	10 20 30 40 50 90	10 20 30 40 50 90
8.	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40	20 30 40 50 60 90	10 20 30 40 50 90	10 20 30 40 50 90
9.	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40	20 30 40 50 60 90	10 20 30 40 50 90	10 20 30 40 50 90
10.	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40	20 30 40 50 60 90	10 20 30 40 50 90	10 20 30 40 50 90
11.	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40	20 30 40 50 60 90	10 20 30 40 50 90	10 20 30 40 50 90
12.	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40 50 60 70 90	10 20 30 40	20 30 40 50 60 90	10 20 30 40 50 90	10 20 30 40 50 90

## Alternate Assessment Survey Directions

### County/District/School and SELPA Codes

Enter the official county-district-school (CDS) code and SELPA code that the California Department of Education issued to the site where the student is receiving services. Contact your special education or site administrator, if necessary.

### Student Identification

Enter the 16-digit student identifier used for the state's CASEMIS data system.

### Date

Enter the date when the IEP team reviewed and approved the completed Alternate Assessment Survey. (MM-DD-YY)

### Primary Disability Category

Write down the code for the student's primary disability.

010	Mental Retardation	060	Emotional Disturbance	100	Deaf-Blindness
020	Hard of Hearing	070	Orthopedic Impairment	110	Multiple Disabilities
030	Deaf	080	Other Health Impairment	120	Autism
040	Speech or Language Impairment	090	Specific Learning Disability	130	Traumatic Brain Injury
050	Visual Impairment				

### Name or Initials

Write down the student's first and last name or initials.

### Date of Birth

Write down the student's date of birth (MM-DD-YY)

### Gender

Select the student's gender.

If the student has more than twelve goals fill out a second (or third, etc.) form and check the "additional form" box.

### Goal Key Words

Write one or two key words that describe the IEP goal to be rated (i.e., picture identification, throwing a ball, eye gaze, etc.).

**Functional Focus.** Circle one number corresponding to the content area that best describes the instructional goal.

If none of the listed areas reasonably describe the goal, circle "90" (other).

10	Communication	50	Mobility, Motor skills
20	Self Care, Independent Living	60	Social, Emotional
30	Functional Academics	70	Recreation, Leisure
40	Vocational skills	90	Other

### Curricular Content Area

Circle one number corresponding to the content area embodied in each IEP goal. If none of the listed area reasonably describes the goal, circle "90" (other).

10	English-Language Arts	50	Health
20	History-Social Science	60	Physical Education
30	Mathematics	70	Visual and Performing Arts
40	Science	90	Other

### Mastery/Progress Rating

Circle one number that best corresponds to the degree of mastery exhibited by the student towards the goal.

10	Beginning: No progress.	30	Intermediate: Substantial progress (50-9% of goal met)
20	Transitional: Partial progress (1 -49% of goal met)	40	Competent: Goal met or exceeded

### Reason for not Meeting Goal

If the student had a mastery/progress rating of 10 or 20 circle the number that best corresponds to the reason for not meeting the goal.

20	More time needed	50	Need to review or revise goal
30	Excessive absence or tardiness	60	Need to revise instruction
40	Insufficient opportunity for practice	90	Other

### Primary Data Source

Circle one number that describes the primary source of information used to document goal mastery.

10	Performance assessment	40	Parent/guardian observation
20	Work sample analysis	50	Standardized or commercial assessment
30	Teacher observation	90	Other

### Secondary Data Source

Circle one number that describes the secondary source of information used to document goal mastery.

10	Performance assessment	40	Parent/guardian observation
20	Work sample analysis	50	Standardized or commercial assessment
30	Teacher observation	90	Other

## Appendix C: Definitions and Examples of Content Areas

### 1. Communication

Skills relating to the ability to comprehend and express information in a variety of ways. The development of receptive and expressive language skills, including nonverbal and gestured communication, the use of augmented communication systems and the ability to comprehend and express emotions. Examples:

• Receptive language	• Attending
• Expressive language	• Oral Motor Skills (related to speech development)
• Facial expression	• Use of assistive technology

### 2. Self-Care/Independent Living

Skills relating to toileting, eating, dressing, hygiene and grooming. Includes skills related to functioning within a home, maintenance of one's health, and purchasing or obtaining goods and services. Examples:

• Clothing care	• Food preparation
• Feeding	• Oral Motor Skills (relating to eating skills)
• Following rules	• Housekeeping skills

### 3. Motor Skills, Mobility

Skills relating to gross motor development and ambulation, including strength, balance and coordination. Skills related to physical activities. Skills related to increased independence and physical access to both the school campus and the community. Examples:

• Street safety	• Use of playground equipment
• Wheelchair use	• Recreational object control
• Mobility skills	• Walking

### 4. Functional Academics

Abilities and skills related to academics that also have direct application in one's life. The acquisition of academic skills that are functional in terms of independent living. The development of prerequisite skills, including fine motor development, cognitive skills and pre-operational activities. Examples:

• Attending	• Math
• Computer usage	• Concept development
• General knowledge	• Reading/symbol identification

### 5. Vocational

Abilities related to procuring or holding a job in the community and the development of specific work skills. May include task completion, self-management and job-related interactions with peers and adults.

• Assembly tasks	• Following directions
• Left/Right orientation	• Independent work skills
• Time management	• Sorting Tasks



## 6. Social, Emotional

Skills related to regulating behavior, social exchanges, coping with demands and controlling impulses. May include the development of social skills, responding to situational cues and making choices. For young children, includes the development of play skills.

• Eye contact	• Using appropriate behavior in school/community
• Anger control	• Sharing and cooperating
• Compliance	• Manners

## 7. Recreation, Leisure

Skills related to pursuing hobbies, interests, sports activities, or other appropriate activities undertaken in free time. May include activities done alone or with others. Examples:

• Games, puzzles	• Social gatherings
• Arts, crafts	• Hobbies, e.g., collecting things
• Music, rhythm	• Spectator sports, participation in team or individual sports

Note: Some skills can fall under one or more categories, depending on the specific nature of the task and the way the goal is written. For example, attending behavior may fit within any area depending on the situation. If the student is attending to the spoken word or a public school lecture, it would likely be considered a communication task. If the student is attending to a vocational task, it would be listed under the pre-vocational/vocational area.